ment from the allotted sites. Efforts are being made to resolve the problem early.

Purchase of iodised salt by N.C.C.F.

461. SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES be pleased to refer to reply to Unstarred Question 1856 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th November 1988 and state:

(a) the name and address of the supplier of iodised salt to NCCF and quantity purchased;

(b) whether the purchases were made through the established procedure of inviting tenders or through pick-and-choose;

(c) whether the purchase was made with the approval of competent authority, if so, the name of that Authority;

(d) the quantity found 'Unfit for human conspmption' by the Public Analyst;

(e) whether any precautions were taken to ensure quality control and, if not, the officer responsible therefor;

(f) whether Bank guarantees were taken from the handling Agent for 'Due performance' of duties and if not, why and the officers responsible for this serious loss and the disciplinary action taken against him; and

(g) whether the legal adviser of NCCF have advised the Federation to file a suit on Mizoram Court instead of taking any action against the involved officers of NCCF, as alleged in the 'Purchanot' weekly of 8th December, 1988?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI D. L. BAITHA): (a) to (c) NCCF have reported that it had purchased 3320.825 MTs (44.291 bags) of iodizeed salt from Hindustan Salt Ltd. of Rajasthan, a Government of India undertaking, without inviting tenders and the purchases were made by the Regional Manager (East).

(d) NCCF had a stock of 35415 bags in stock when the Public Analyst declared salt as unfit for human consumption.

(e) The purchase was from the Government of India Undertaking and the NCCF appointed a handling agent at suppliers end to supervise, despatches after selection of proper quality heaps, getting the salt properly crushed, packed and also by checking quality and quantity.

(f) No bank guarantee was taken from the handling agent as normally no guarantee is taken in such cases.

(g) Since the Mizoram Government failed to lift the stock against its commitment and the handling agent failed to keep the stock in safe custody and reported shortages, the NCCF have decided to file a suit in the Court against the parties for the loss suffered.

Production of Aluminium in the Country

462. SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) what is the total production of aluminium in the country at present;

(b) how much quantity of aluminium is needed for our consumption every year and what has been the shortfall in the last five years and the resultant imports during those years;

(c) whether it is a fact that Government is considering to stop its import from the next year; and

(d) if so, how does Government propose to meet the shortage?

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR): (a) During 1988-89, the to-

tal production of primary aluminium in the country is expected to be around 3,60,000 tonnes.

(b) The indigenous production and imports of aluminium from 1984-85 to 1988-89 have been as under:—

Year	Indigenous production	Imports by MMTC	Total availability
	(in 000' tonnes).		
1984-85	276	47	323
1985-86	265	20	285
1986-87	257	65	322
1987-88	278	55	333
1988-89 (estimated).	360	..	360

(c) and (d) With the progressive increase in the production of aluminium metal by National Aluminium Company Limited (NALCO), monthly production of aluminium metal has increased from about 26,000 tonnes in April, 1988 to over 33,00 tonnes in January, 1989 Planning Commission have estimated that during 1989-90, the production will be around 436,000 tonnes. As the demand is likely to be around 400,000 tonnes, there will be a surplus of over 30,000 tonnes.

However, import of aluminium including aluminium rods have been placed on open Geneal Licence (OGL) with marginal level of customs duty of Rs. 500 per tonne from July, 1988, which will cater to any unforeseen situations.

Discount on Fertilisers

463. SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any directives have been issued recently on fertiliser discounts?

(b) if so, extent of discount and whether these are mandatory or mere recommendations; and

(c) whether any reimbursement of such discounts is also allowed?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF FERTILIZERS IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI R. PRABHU): (a) Yes, sir

(b) and (c) Government of India directed the fertiliser companies to give a uniform discount of 7.5 per cent on the notified maximum consumer price of urea to the farmers during Kharif 1988 season (April—Sept. 1988). It was also decided to compansate the fertilizer companies for the discount on actual sales of urea during this period. Subsequently, the Government of India decided to permit fertiliser companies to continue the 7.5 per cent discount during rabi 1988-89 season also (October 1988—March 1989) but no compensation was allowed to them for the discount on sales of urea in Rabi 1988-89.

Cut in the Rice Quota of Kerala

464. SHRI N. E. BALARAM:

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:

Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the rice quota for Kerala State has been drastically cut recently;

(b) if so, what is the monthly requirements of rice for the public distribution in the State; what was the monthly allotments during the year 1988 and at present after the latest cut; and

(c) what are the reasons for the reduction in the allotments to the State?